DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 262 289 CE 042 737

TITLE	Development of Criteria to Measure the Extent of Implementation and the Effectiveness of Demonstration Projects in Vocational Education. Recommended Criteria for the Review of Demonstration Project Proposals.
INSTITUTION	Development Associates, Inc., Arlington, Va.
SPONS AGENCY	Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	17 May 79
CONTRACT	300-78-0574
NOTE	36p.; For related documents, see CE 042 733-738.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Criteria; *Demonstration Programs; Educational Innovation; Information Dissemination; *Program Effectiveness; Program Implementation; *Program Proposals; Research and Development; Research Utilization; *Success; *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS	Impact

ABSTRACT

This document addresses the second objective of a study to develop criteria to measure the effectiveness of vocational education programs. An introduction provides background to the project and the objective addressed here, namely the recommendation of proposal review criteria. Section II discusses development of the recommended criteria, which are intended to distinguish those applications that are predictive of the ability of the application to achieve successful implementation, documentation, and regeneration. Ten proposal review criterion categories are presented in Section III: evidence of need, educational significance, measurable objectives, appropriate activites, efficient management, reasonable budget, appropriate personnel and facilities, technically sound evaluation plan, commitment of applicant organization, and effective dissemination plan. Within each criterion category are several criteria, all of which are characteristics of successful projects. An explanation and rationale are given first in each category. The criteria for the category are then listed with a brief explanation for each one. Section IV details proposal review procedures. The proposal review form is provided. (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED262289

DEVELOPMENT OF CRITERIA TO MEASURE THE EXTENT OF IMPLEMENTATION AND THE EFFECTIVENESS OF DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

USOE CONTRACT NO. 300-78-0574

Recommended Criteria for The Review of Demonstration Project Proposals

Submitted To:

BUREAU OF OCCUPATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION
U.S. Office of Education
Washington, D.C.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Submitted By:

DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC.
2924 Columbia Pike
Arlington, Virginia 22204

May 17, 1979

ED262737

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	FRAMEWORK FOR PROPOSAL REVIEW CRITERIA	3
III.	RECOMMENDED CRITERIA FOR REVIEWING DEMONSTRATION PROJECT PROPOSALS	8
IV.	PROPOSAL REVIEW PROCEDURES	20

I. INTRODUCTION

According to the General Accounting Office* and a committee of the National Academy of Sciences,** vocational education demonstration projects funded by the U.S. Office of Education have not had documented, widespread impact. Because of these findings, significant additions to the Vocational Education Act of 1963 were incorporated into the Education Amendments of 1976. These additions call for identifiable benefits to result from the demonstration program effort. Specifically, the new legislation requires that grants and contracts be made only when the applicant demonstrates a reasonable probability that improved products or practices will result which will be used in a substantial number of classrooms or other learning situations within five years after the termination date of the federal grant award.

In response to the above, Development Associates, Inc. was awarded a contract by the U.S. Office of Education to develop criteria to measure the effectiveness of vocational education demonstration projects. The study has the following specific objectives:

- To define and specify what will be considered interim and final acceptable evidence that a demonstration project has resulted in improved teaching techniques or curriculum materials that have been used in a substantial number of classrooms or other learning situations within five years after the termination of the grant or contract; (interim acceptable evidence is that evidence which should be expected during the last phase of external federal support and final acceptable evidence is that evidence which should be expected within five years after the termination of federal support);

- To generate and recommend criteria for the review of demonstration project applications or proposals, the use of which will distinguish those applications which are predictive of the ability of the applicant to achieve the interim and final acceptable evidence specified in response to the above objective;

---

*General Accounting Office. Career Education: Status and Needed Improvements. Washington, D.C.: General Accounting Office, Division of Manpower and Welfare, 1976.

**National Academy of Science's Committee on Vocational Education Research and Development. Assessing Vocational Education Research and Development. 1976.

- To produce a monograph for improving and measuring the impact of vocational education demonstration projects, for use by program planners, implementers, monitors, evaluators, and disseminators; and

- To diffuse the products of this project to appropriate Curriculum Coordination Centers, State Department of Education personnel (including RCU directors), and local education agency personnel (including local directors of federally-administered vocational education demonstration projects) through the preparation of the monograph and the conduct of training workshops.

This document addresses the second objective listed above, the recommendation of proposal review criteria.

II. FRAMEWORK FOR PROPOSAL REVIEW CRITERIA

The proposal review criteria being recommended in this document were developed to distinguish those applications which are predictive of the ability of the applicant to achieve successful implementation, documentation, and regeneration. This means that evidence should be present in the proposal which indicates a reasonable probability that: (1) the proposed project will be successfully implemented; (2) evidence will be available to document this success; and (3) there is a reasonable probability that project generated practices and products will have widespread use.

Demonstration project characteristics upon which the selection of these proposed review criteria were based were first identified through a review of literature on the implementation and evaluation of educational innovations. Following the literature review, a draft of criteria, documentation, and standards required for the interim and final acceptable evidence of demonstration project effectiveness was prepared and reviewed by an advisory panel representing various constituencies in the field of vocational education and educational program evaluation. Also, eight "successful" demonstration projects were visited. The eight projects were randomly selected from a list of successful projects nominated by state RCU directors and USOE. Besides discussions with project staff, project documents were collected and reviewed during these visits. These documents included proposals; dissemination literature; quarterly, interim and final reports; and evaluation reports. Proposal review criteria and guidelines from a number of states were also reviewed. Then the criteria for interim and final acceptable evidence of project success were revised and the proposal review criteria were developed.

The proposal review criteria presented here were designed to be consistent with the indicators of project success found in the literature and the criteria for evidence of project impact, both of which will be discussed in a monograph to be prepared under this contract. The indicators of project success are reflected in each of the proposal review criterion categories; and provisions for meeting the criteria, documentation, and standards requirements of the interim and final acceptable evidence of impact are also built into the proposal review criteria. Interim acceptable evidence is defined as that evidence of project success which should be present during the last phase of federal support. The criteria for this evidence are demonstration impact, dissemination, and efforts toward institutionalization. Final acceptable evidence is that evidence which should be expected within five years after termination of federal support. Criteria for this are utilization, long-term impact, and continuation/adaption impact. Paradigms of the interim and final acceptable evidence appear on pages 4 and 5. A discussion of these paradigms appears in a separate document, Recommendations for Interim and Final Acceptable Evidence, May 15, 1979.

INTERIM ACCEPTABLE EVIDENCE

CRITERIA	DOCUMENTATION	STANDARD
Demonstration Impact: Extent of immediate impact on demonstration project target group(s).	Primary outcome measures from demonstration site including adequate recordkeeping system for followup data collection.	Significant positive primary outcomes which can be attributed to program intervention.
Dissemination: Quality and extent of dissemination activities.	Evaluation of dissemination strategies and materials. Enumeration of dissemination activities, including adequate records of recipients of program materials.	Dissemination strategies and materials include sufficient coverage and details of program to facilitate replication. Achievement of dissemination objectives stated in the project plan.
Efforts Toward Institutionalization: Attempts being made to insure program longevity after termination of federal funding.	Description of efforts being made.	The presence of efforts being made toward institutionalization.

FINAL ACCEPTABLE EVIDENCE

CRITERIA	DOCUMENTATION	STANDARD
Utilization: Extent of utilization or spread	Program continuation in original site and adaption in other sites including level and description of implementation.	Program is being continued and/or has been adapted by others.
Long-Term Impact: Extent of long-term impact on demonstration project target group(s)	Followup measures of program effects on demonstration target group(s).	Significant positive effects which can be attributed to program intervention.
Continuation/Adaption Impact; Extent of immediate impact on target group(s) from continuing and adapting sites	Primary outcome measures from continuing and adapting sites.	Significant positive primary outcomes which can be attributed to program intervention.

Ten proposal review criterion categories are presented in this document. Within each criterion category are several criteria, all of which are characteristic of successful projects. Criterion Category I (Evidence of Need) establishes that a valid need for the project exists and that this need extends beyond the target area. It defines the scope of the problem and the potential for widespread use of the practices and products generated by the proposed project. Criterion Category II (Educational Significance) evaluates the evidence presented that the proposed project will, indeed, meet the needs of the target population and that the proposed project director is knowledgeable in the field.

Criterion Category III (Measurable Objectives) and Criterion Category IV (Appropriate Activities) are the heart of the project design. They provide the structure for a well-managed project and introduce measurable objectives as the means by which demonstration impact, extent of utilization, and continuation/adaption impact can be assessed. Efforts toward institutionalization are suggested as an important early activity for the project.

Criterion Categories V (Efficient Management), VI(Reasonable Budget), and VII (Appropriate Personnel and Facilities) are the support system for attaining the objectives. They contribute to the successful implementation of the demonstration project and, therefore, should be adequately documented for replication purposes. Inclusion of appropriate management, budget, personnel and facilities information in the dissemination literature is a criterion of interim acceptable evidence.

Criterion Category VIII (Technically Sound Evaluation Plan) suggests building both a formative and outcome/impact evaluation plan into the project design. The formative evaluation should be used as a management tool while the outcome/impact evaluation measures the effectiveness of the program. The outcome/impact evaluation plan that is presented in the proposal should make provisions for meeting the criteria set forth in the interim and final acceptable evidence. That is, provisions should be made for reliably documenting demonstration impact and long term impact, the former being documented during the federal grant period and the latter being documented one to two years following the federal grant period.

Criterion Category IX (Commitment of Applicant Organization) has ramifications for project success during implementation and project longevity following termination of federal funding. It assesses the extent of organizational support the project can expect and the strength of that commitment. Without an overt commitment of support from the applicant organization, project success is not likely.

Criterion Category X (Effective Dissemination Plan) marks the beginning of the diffusion process and widespread use of project materials. It addresses the quality of plans for project demonstration and the distribution of information concerning the project during the last phase of

federal funding. It is also the basis for assessing dissemination as interim acceptable evidence of project success.

The proposal review criteria are presented in detail in the next chapter. They are divided into the ten criterion categories. Under each category an explanation and rationale are given. Then the criteria for the category are listed with a brief explanation for each one.

III. RECOMMENDED CRITERIA FOR REVIEWING DEMONSTRATION PROJECT PROPOSALS

CRITERION CATEGORY I - EVIDENCE OF NEED

Evidence of Need focuses on the definition and scope of the problem being addressed in the proposal. The purpose of this category is to establish that a widespread need for the proposed program or practice exists; more specifically, that the needs of the target population as described in the proposal are within the parameters of the announced program priorities, that a need exists both in the target area and beyond, that the stated need is based, whenever possible, on statistically reliable evidence rather than subjective impressions, and that previous attempts at a solution have not resolved the problem. Thus, there is an extensive need for intervention and a viable solution has the potential for widespread impact. This criterion category establishes the potential for utilization, one of the criteria which define final acceptable evidence of project impact.

CRITERION I-A. The proposal focuses on the announced priority.

The proposal should be relevant to the specified priorities and fulfill the requirements set forth in the RFP.

CRITERION I-B. Need is clearly defined with respect to the population to be served.

The needs of the target population should be clearly defined. The discussion should include a description of the characteristics of the population to be served, who will be included, and who will not be included.

CRITERION I-C. Sufficient statistical evidence of need within the demonstration project target area is provided.

Whenever possible the extent of need within the demonstration project target area should be supported by reliable statistical evidence which appropriately addresses the population to be served as defined in Criterion I-B. Statistical data are preferable to the judgments of selected experts particularly if an alternative selection of experts would yield different opinions.

CRITERION I-D. The proposal addresses the seriousness of need in the target area and previous attempts the applicant organization and others have made to solve the problem on their own.

The social significance of the need, previous attempts to provide solutions, the absence of substitute solutions, the urgency of the problem, and the newness of the proposed intervention in the target area should be discussed. Need may be considered as the difference between what is being provided and what should be provided. Evidence of need for the project may involve economic, social and/or environmental impact considerations. The applicant should state whether or not this, or a similar proposal, has been submitted to the agency or another agency or organization; and whether or not this proposal is an extension of, or an addition to, a previous or existing project. If it is, details should be provided.

CRITERION I-E. Sufficient statistical evidence of need for populations beyond the demonstration project target area is provided.

Whenever possible, reliable statistical evidence should be provided which indicates the extent of populations beyond the demonstration project target area that could benefit from such an intervention.

CRITERION CATEGORY II - EDUCATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE

Educational Significance scrutinizes the intervention and its appropriateness for meeting the stated needs of the target population(s) described in Criterion Category I. It examines the strength of the supporting evidence for the intervention, the applicant's knowledge of the field, and the transportability of the intervention. This contributes to the potential for utilization, one of the criteria which define final acceptable evidence of project impact.

CRITERION II-A. Sufficient evidence is provided that the proposed intervention has a reasonable probability of leading to the expected impact.

The proposed intervention and its expected impact should be described. The intervention should be directly related to the needs of the target population(s). Evidence of probable impact should be provided by such things as references to results from similar interventions.

CRITERION II-B. Sufficient evidence is provided that the applicant is knowledgeable of the "present state of the art" for the intervention proposed.

Evidence should be provided that the project is based on appropriate and relevant literature. The applicant should demonstrate a working knowledge of what has been done, what is being done, and what is projected in the field. The review may include both published and unpublished works. The pertinent literature should be summarized. A rationale for the proposal and a description of the uniqueness of the intervention should be provided. Similar studies which have been undertaken in the recent past should be referenced.

CRITERION II-C. Sufficient evidence is provided that the proposed intervention has educational significance beyond the demonstration site and can be implemented in other locations with reasonable expectations of comparable impact.

Evidence should be provided that the proposed intervention clearly defines and focuses on a problem of major importance including its expected contribution or potential impact. In addition, the transportability and potential project practices and products should be addressed with respect to their possible application in other programs or geographical areas.

CRITERION CATEGORY III. MEASURABLE OBJECTIVES

Measureable Objectives are the heart of the project design. They state the approach to the problem and the ends toward which all activities

are aimed. Objectives that are realistic and clear are essential for efficient project management. Objectives that are independent of each other, stated in measurable terms, and arranged in a hierarchy with the primary objectives addressing expected impact on the target population are important for program evaluation. Specifically, they are necessary for the evaluation of demonstration impact, one of the criteria which define interim acceptable evidence. They are also essential for identifying components of the demonstration project which have been continued at the original site and adapted at other sites in order to assess utilization and continuation/adaptation impact, both part of final acceptable evidence.

CRITERION III-A. The objectives address the stated needs.

The project objectives should relate to the population needs discussed in Criterion Category I, should focus on the priority area, and should be consistent with the relevant literature.

CRITERION III-B. The objectives are attainable.

The objectives should be realistic and capable of being achieved as outlined in the proposal.

CRITERION III-C. The objectives are defined in measurable terms.

The objectives should be independent of one another and clearly stated in measurable terms. Where applicable, they should state who will exhibit the behavior, what the behavior will be (in observable terms), and what intervention will bring it about.

CRITERION III-D. The objectives are arranged in approximate order of importance with primary objectives addressing the expected impact on the population to be served.

The objectives should be arranged, as nearly as possible, in a hierarchy of importance. For evaluation purposes, the primary objective should address the expected impact on the target population.

CRITERION CATEGORY IV. APPROPRIATE ACTIVITIES

This category evaluates the appropriateness of the project activities for achieving the stated objectives and addresses specific procedures that are related to project success. Criteria for selecting project participants are important to the intent of the demonstration program and for reliable evaluation of demonstration impact (i.e. the project's impact on the target population, one of the criteria included in interim acceptable evidence). The usefulness and quality of project generated practices and products will be enhanced if an opportunity for input is provided to potential users. In addition, plans for early efforts toward institutionalization (a criterion of interim acceptable evidence) should be specified.

CRITERION IV-A. Activities are related to objectives and can be expected to result in attainment of the objectives.

A specific description should be provided of the activities proposed for each major step in the project. These activities should be specifically identified with the objective that they are designed to accomplish and should be expected to lead to the attainment of the objective.

CRITERION IV-B. Criteria for selecting participants are clearly described.

The procedures and criteria for selecting project participants and comparison groups (for program evaluation) should be stated. In addition, provisions for assuring non-discrimination should be discussed.

CRITERION IV-C. Plans are outlined for including potential users in the development of project practices and products.

Provisions should be made to include input from potential users during all phases of the project to ensure the usefulness and quality of the practices and products generated and to increase motivation to participate.

CRITERION IV-D. Procedures are outlined for increasing probability of program longevity or institutionalization.

Plans should include steps to be taken to insure financial support of successful aspects of the project upon termination of federal funding, and methods for infusing them into the ongoing educational system.

CRITERION V. EFFICIENT MANAGEMENT PLAN

This criterion evaluates the efficiency of the management plan, an important factor in project success. The criterion assesses whether or not the proposed plan can guide the project toward its stated objectives within the designated time frame and budget. Thus, it looks at organization, position descriptions, intraproject and interorganizational relationships, task assignments, and scheduling, among other things. Sufficient time and effort for planning and start-up are indispensable for project success because they build a firm foundation upon which to implement the project. Formative evaluation can be a useful management tool because it provides a framework for measuring inputs in relation to processes and effects on an ongoing basis so that procedures can be adjusted if there are indications that the project is not moving toward the anticipated goals. A good recordkeeping system is essential not only for efficient management but also for replication purposes. The necessity for keeping specific types of records are discussed under other criterion categories. Activities required for the transition from federal funding to other sources of support (an indication of efforts toward institutionalization, a criterion of interim acceptable evidence) should also be addressed in the management plan.

CRITERION V-A. The proposal specifies a plan for the management of the project which includes relationships among the involved organizations and individuals, and responsibilities of each.

The plan should address the manner in which the project will be organized and managed to accomplish the objectives set forth in the proposal. Methods for controlling operations and procedures for review and quality control of work should be stated. The plan should also include: (1) the organizational structure of the project team; (2) written position descriptions which differentiate staff members' roles and responsibilities; (3) a person-loading chart which illustrates the level of effort devoted to each task by the various project staff members; (4) a description of the relationship of the project team to the grantee and the funding agency; (5) a description of the relationship of the project team to other individuals and organizations who will be involved with the project including consultants, subcontractors, and advisory committee members.

CRITERION V-B. The management plan relates to the project objectives and activities.

The plan should provide a direct relationship between the management procedures, implementation of project activities, and the attainment of project objectives.

CRITERION V-C. A realistic time schedule for starting and completing each of the project activities is provided.

The time schedule should be realistic and attainable even though it may be somewhat tentative. Step by step procedures with starting and ending dates should be clearly diagrammed for each project activity in the form of a GANTT chart, PERT flowchart, or other diagramming mechanism.

CRITERION V-D. The project schedule allows sufficient time and effort for planning and start-up.

All necessary elements for project implementation should be carefully planned and in a state of readiness before delivery of services begins. This includes: (1) the hiring and training of staff; (2) acquisition of adequate facilities and supplies; (3) establishment of a recordkeeping system; (4) establishment of an accounting system; (5) provisions for collecting baseline data for the formative and outcome/impact evaluations; (6) establishment of relationships with cooperating individuals and organizations; and (7) establishment of criteria and methods for choosing project participants and comparison group members (where applicable).

CRITERION V-E. Provisions are made for using formative evaluation as a management tool.

Formative evaluation should be used as a management tool to document cause and effect on an ongoing basis. Procedures and standards for measuring progress should be stated.

CRITERION V-F. An apporpriate recordkeeping system for project management is proposed.

Plans for an efficient and well-integrated recordkeeping system should be outlined so that all necessary information is documented. Plans may include designing new forms, the use of computerized data systems, and production of reports.

CRITERION V-G. The management plan addresses transitional activities required for the survival of the program or use of its products following termination of federal funding.

Activities required for the transition of the program from federal funding to incorporation into the ongoing educational system should be outlined. The plan should address such things as: (1) acquisition of alternative financial support; (2) establishment of liaisons necessary for transition; (3) any necessary reallocation of project personnel, facilities, equipment, and/or materials; and (4) relocation of records, if necessary.

CRITERION CATEGORY VI. REASONABLE BUDGET

An appropriate budget is related to project success. This criterion category examines the reasonableness of the budget in providing sufficient support for project activities so that the objectives can be met, while at the same time, funds are not wasted. The proposal should outline procedures for maintaining cost data so that reports can be made regarding cost-effectiveness and costs of replication, as aides to potential adapters. These contribute to the quality of the dissemination literature, a criterion of interim acceptable evidence.

CRITERION VI-A. Total project costs are reasonable in relation to size, scope, duration, and anticipated results of the project.

Budget figures should be reasonable and realistic for the scope of the project. The budget should be adequately presented and the expenditures justified as they relate to the proposed objectives and outcomes.

CRITERION VI-B. Budget line items are appropriate for carrying out project activities.

The proposed expenditures for each activity should be appropriate and adequate for the activity and the contribution the activity makes to the total project.

CRITERION VI-C. The proposal provides a plan for the documentation of costs to facilitate replication by potential adapters.

Plans should be made to maintain cost data so that reports can be made by such things as (1) per-pupil and total activity costs; (2) direct and indirect costs; and (3) fixed/variable costs.

CRITERION CATEGORY VII. APPROPRIATE PERSONNEL AND FACILITIES

This category assesses whether or not the personnel and facilities proposed are appropriate, adequate, and provide the support necessary for project success. The project director needs management capabilities and subject matter expertise to keep the project efficiently targeted on its stated objectives. Persons involved with the project should be qualified and commit enough time to the project to adequately fulfill their responsibilities. Often, too much is promised in too short a period of time or advisory committee members are personally overcommitted and cannot devote adequate time to the project. On the other hand, the inefficient use of time can increase the cost of operating the project. Project personnel, teachers, and others involved with the project need support and training in order to maintain their motivation and effectiveness. Project locations should be convenient for the target population and facilities should be reasonably accessible and attractive so that continuous participation in project activities is encouraged. Cooperative arrangements regarding facilities can undermine a project if not adequately managed. Therefore, evidence should be provided which indicates that such arrangements are in the best interests of the project.

CRITERION VII-A. Proposed personnel, consultants, subcontractors, and advisory group members have the necessary qualifications for the project.

The proposed staff should possess the qualifications, competencies, and experience appropriate to their assigned tasks. Proposed consultants, subcontractors, or advisory committee members should be specified. How they were selected and why they are qualified and appropriate to the goals of the project should be included.

CRITERION VII-B. The project director has management capabilities as well as subject matter expertise.

The project director should have the necessary qualifications for managing the day-to-day operations of the project so that the objectives will be met within the time frame and budget proposed. In addition, he/she should demonstrate an expertise in the proposed intervention.

CRITERION VII-C. Amount of time to be committed to the project by each individual is sufficient to carry out the proposed activities.

The proposal should specify the percentage of time to be assigned to the project by each staff member and clearly show that it is sufficient to insure completion of all project tasks. If an advisory committee, volunteers, or other individuals will be participating in the project, assurances should be provided that these persons have both the time and the committment to fulfill their responsibilities as outlined in the proposal.

CRITERION VII-D. Provisions are made for adequate support and training of project personnel, teachers, and others, where applicable.

The support and training that will be provided for project personnel, teachers, and others who participate in the project should be specified in the proposal. This includes such things as inservice training, professional guidance, and additional compensation or time off for participating.

CRITERION VII-E. Location(s), facilities, equipment, and materials are appropriate for the project.

Reasonable evidence should be provided that location(s), facilities, equipment, and materials for the project are both appropriate and adequate. The location of project activities should be identified and reasons given for its selection. Any cooperative arrangements regarding facilities should be specified. A description and justification should be provided for equipment and materials needed for the project, especially if they are required for special needs.

CRITERION CATEGORY VIII. TECHNICALLY SOUND EVALUATION PLAN

This category is designed to assess the credibility of the evaluation plan. Both formative and outcome/impact evaluations should be built into the project design. Plans should be formulated early so that baseline data can be collected; and personnel and budget resources to be utilized for the evaluations should be specified. The conduct of a technically-sound formative evaluation is associated with project success and is necessary for replication purposes. As a management tool, it can operate as a continuing program monitoring device for decision-making so adjustments can be made in project activities to keep the project focused on its stated objectives. As a result, crises can often be anticipated and avoided. In addition, the documentation of inputs, processes, and effects provides information for replication. A good recordkeeping system is necessary for maximum utilization of the data throughout the life of the project. Baseline data need to be documented as do changes in inputs, processes, and effects so that factors leading to any given effect(s) will be correctly identified.

In addition to a formative evaluation, an outcome/impact evaluation is necessary for measuring project effectiveness. The evaluation plan should include the collection of baseline data at the beginning of the intervention and outcome data at the end of the intervention period as documentation of demonstration impact, a criterion for interim acceptable evidence. Provisions should also be made for the collection of follow-up data one or two years following termination of the federal grant to document the project's long-term impact, as stated in the final acceptable evidence. Inclusion of a follow-up data collection methodology in the project evaluation plan is for the purposes of consistency throughout the data collection process, especially in terms of selection of variables, selection and follow-up of respondents, instrument design, etc. To meet the standards set forth in interim acceptable evidence, the outcome/impact evaluation plan should be technically sound so that the project's impact can be reliably attributed to the intervention; and standards for judging the success of the

project should be established during the design phase rather than during or after data collection, when their selection could be arbitrarily influenced. Adequate records of the outcome/impact evaluation data should be kept for a follow-up study as stated in the documentation of demonstration impact for interim acceptable evidence.

CRITERION VIII-A. The proposal includes a plan for the formative evaluation of the project.

Provisions should be made in the proposal for using formative evaluation as a management tool.

CRITERION VIII-B. The formative evaluation plan is technically sound so that processes can be reliably related to effects.

The proposed formative evaluation should reliably relate processes to outcomes so that procedures can be refined and replicated. If improvement in student outcomes is the primary objective, student progress should be assessed frequently rather than relying solely on pretest/postest evaluations. The project should assist teachers in interpreting student scores and their input into possible program adjustments.

CRITERION VIII-C. A plan for an appropriate recordkeeping system for the formative evaluation is outlined which documents project processes and effects.

Plans for establishing a recordkeeping system for formative data should be specified. Formative data should be systematically and efficiently collected and recorded so that it is easily accessible, interpretable, and usable.

CRITERION VIII-D. The proposal provides for an outcome/impact evaluation including appropriate preparations for follow-up.

Provisions should be made for adequate evaluation of the effectiveness of the project and for determining the extent to which objectives are met. The evaluation design should include the collection of outcome data and provisions for the collection of follow-up data approximately one to two years following termination of federal funding even though the demonstration project evaluator may not be responsible for the collection of the follow-up data.

CRITERION VIII-E. The outcome/impact evaluation plan is technically sound so that the observed effects can be attributed to the intervention.

The plan should provide for the collection and analyses of objective information, focusing on the priority area, which will measure how successfully project objectives are attained. Assessment of the adequacy of the evaluation plan should be based on whether or not: (1) independent and dependent variables are specified and relate to project objectives; (2) measures are identified for the variables selected; (3) the measures are reliable and valid; (4) subjects are clearly identified; (5) subjects chosen are representative of the

project's target population; (6) control or comparison groups are used when necessary to rule out the influence of extraneous variables; (7) if a sample is used, the sampling plan will yield statistically reliable results; (8) the number of subjects is sufficient for performing the necessary analyses; (9) data collection procedures are described; (10) a data analysis plan, including statistical procedures, is given and is adequate for purposes of answering the evaluation questions; and (11) an appropriate timetable and plan of work are presented.

CRITERION VIII-F. Standards for judging success are stated in the outcome/impact evaluation plan and are consistent with the project objectives.

Measures for evaluating each objective are stated and are appropriate. In addition, standards of success for evaluating each objective are specified.

CRITERION VIII-G. The proposal includes a plan for a recordkeeping system for documentation of results and identification of participants for collection of follow-up data.

Plans for establishing a recordkeeping system for the outcome/impact data should be specified. Outcome/impact data should be systematically and efficiently collected and recorded so that it is easily accessible, interpretable, and usable. Records should include the evaluation methodology, criteria for the selection of project participants and comparison group members (if any), names, addresses, and telephone numbers of project participants and comparison group members (if any) for follow-up, baseline data, pretest/postest, and other relevant data for judging project effectiveness. Dates when data will be available should be specified.

CRITERION IX. COMMITMENT OF APPLICANT ORGANIZATION

This category assesses the extent of organizational support that is provided for the demonstration project and is the basis for future efforts toward institutionalization, a criterion of interim acceptable evidence. The project will need the conscious and overt support of the applicant organization in order to succeed. A description of the support the applicant organization and cooperating institutions will provide should be specified in writing to assure the funding agency of the support and to avoid misunderstandings concerning this anticipated support. The applicant organization should also state their plans for continuing or institutionalizing project generated practices and products after termination of federal funding so the project will have a lasting effect.

CIRTERION IX-A. The proposal includes a written statement from the applicant organization and cooperating institutions which specifies the type and amount of support they will provide to the project.

The type and amount of support the applicant organization and cooperating institutions will provide to the project should be specified in writing. In addition, conscious and overt support throughout the applicant organization management should be indicated.

CRITERION IX-B. The proposal includes a written statement from the applicant organization which provides evidence of commitment to future funding and/or use of project generated products and practices after termination of federal funding.

A commitment of future funding and/or the planned use of project generated practices and products should be provided by the applicant organization in writing in the proposal.

CRITERION CATEGORY X. EFFECTIVE DISSEMINATION PLAN

This category evaluates plans for project demonstration and the distribution of information concerning project practices and products to encourage adaption of the program by other educational systems. It is designed to meet the requirements of the dissemination criterion for interim acceptable evidence of project impact. Since one of the major purposes for funding a demonstration project is to effect a widespread improvements, the project should have a dissemination plan and dissemination of information should be stated as a measurable objective. Sources of funding for this activity often vary and, thus, should be stated in the proposal to assure the funding agency that adequate financial support will be provided. Records of individuals and organizations receiving information about the project should be kept to facilitate identification of potential adapting sites for the purpose of measuring the extent of utilization of the innovation which is a criterion for final evidence. The dissemination plan should include outreach and saturation strategies to encourage adaption. The dissemination literature should include the kind of information that is needed by a potential adapter to make a decision. The dissemination plan should also include implementation support and guidance that will meet the needs of various adapters since interest in adapting may diminish if implementation appears to be or becomes difficult. Opening the project to potential adapters during the demonstration phase affords an opportunity for viewing the project in action that the dissemination literature alone cannot provide.

CRITERION X-A. Dissemination of information to encourage utilization of the developed practices and products is a project objective.

Dissemination of information about the project which encourages others to adapt the program in their own setting should be stated as a measurable project objective.

CRITERION X-B. The proposal includes a dissemination plan which identifies procedures, target audiences, and the source(s) of funding for demonstration and dissemination.

The dissemination plan should identify potential users of the project practices and products, and enumerate the dissemination strategies that will be targeted to the various user audiences. Source(s) of funding and a plan for keeping adequate records of potential adapters for follow-up purposes should be specified.

CRITERION X-C. The dissemination plan should include an outreach approach and a combination of informative-awareness activities such as newsletters, seminars, conferences, etc. which will be useful to potential adapters in deciding whether or not to replicate the program.

Dissemination activities should reach out and employ information saturation strategies to heighten the awareness of potential new users rather than simply relying on them to respond to the demonstration project. The dissemination literature should be attractive, but not necessarily expensive, and include the kinds of information that potential users need to make a decision about adaption. The literature should include, but not be limited to, project objectives; description of target audience(s); program operations and services delivered; expected project effects; staffing requirements including position descriptions and qualifications necessary for filling these positions, training requirements for staff, teachers, and others; required facilities; required materials; and expected operating costs and per pupil costs.

CRITERION X-D. The dissemination plan should provide for implementation support to new users.

The dissemination plan should provide for varying kinds and amounts of implementation support to meet the needs of different persons.

CRITERION X-E. The dissemination plan provides for the demonstration of exemplary features of the program during the last phase of federal support.

The dissemination plan should include provisions for exhibiting the demonstration project in its own setting to allow potential users to observe it in operation, examine evidence of its effectiveness, and judge its potential use in their own educational setting.

IV. PROPOSAL REVIEW PROCEDURES

To facilitate the use of the proposal review criteria presented in the previous chapter, procedures have been developed and incorporated into a proposal review form. The form calls for a reviewer to rate a proposal as unacceptable, acceptable, or superior on each criterion within each of the ten criterion categories. Then, based on the ratings, the reviewer would assign points to each category. These assigned points would range between zero and a maximum weight that has been assigned to the category. There would be no formula for assigning these points. Rather, the reviewer would make a subjective judgment based on the ratings given the individual criteria and his/her judgment as to their relative importance. After assigning points to all ten categories, the points would be summed to yield an overall proposal score.

As may be seen on the proposal review form in this chapter, weights have not been assigned to the criterion categories. We propose that participants at the second panel meeting assign these weights in conjunction with their task of reviewing the criteria that are being recommended. The panelists will be asked to individually assign weights to the criterion categories by allocating 100 points across the ten categories. The weights to be assigned will depend on how important they feel the categories are to project success. Following this procedure, the mean weights given to each category by the panelists will be calculated and these will be used to determine the weights that will be assigned. By using the panel to assign these weights, we will be taking advantage of their experience in implementing and funding demonstration projects. This procedure is designed to add validity to the proposal review process.

The proposal review form appears on the following pages.

PROPOSAL REVIEW RATING FORM

Project Title _____

_____

Applicant Organization _____

_____

Address _____

_____

Date of Review _____ Reviewer _____

INSTRUCTIONS

This form contains ten proposal review criterion categories. Each category has a designated weight, or maximum number of allowable points, which appear at the end of the category. For example, the maximum number of points for Criterion Category I is____. Under each Criterion Category, several criteria relating to the category are listed and should be considered in assigning points to the category. To rate a proposal, follow the procedures below:

1. Rate each criterion within a Criterion Category as unacceptable, acceptable, or superior by placing an X in the appropriate box.
2. After all of the criteria in a Criterion Category have been rated, the ratings should be used in deciding a score to be assigned to the category. This score may range from zero up to the maximum number of points allowed for the category.
3. Place the assigned score for the Criterion Category in the box at the end of the cateory marked "CRITERION SCORE."
4. After all criterion categories have been scored, sum the points across all ten categories to yield an overall proposal score and enter this score in the box marked "TOTAL POINTS."

At the end of this form, there is space for comments regarding the strong and weak points in the proposal and questions you may wish to raise concerning unclear or ambiguous sections of the proposal.

CRITERION CATEGORY I. EVIDENCE OF NEED

CRITERION I-A. The proposal focuses on the announced priority.

☐ Unacceptable ☐ Acceptable ☐ Superior

CRITERION I-B. Need is clearly defined with respect to the population to be served.

☐ Unacceptable ☐ Acceptable ☐ Superior

CRITERION I-C. Sufficient statistical evidence of need within the demonstration project target area is provided.

☐ Unacceptable ☐ Acceptable ☐ Superior

CRITERION I-D. The proposal addresses the seriousness of need in the target area and previous attempts the applicant organization and others have made to solve the problem on their own.

☐ Unacceptable ☐ Acceptable ☐ Superior

CRITERION I-E. Sufficient statistical evidence of need for populations beyond the demonstration project target area is provided.

☐ Unacceptable ☐ Acceptable ☐ Superior

CATEGORY I SCORE
(maximum =___ points)
☐

CRITERION CATEGORY II. EDUCATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE

CRITERION II-A. Sufficient evidence is provided that the proposed intervention has a reasonable probability of leading to the expected impact.

☐ Unacceptable ☐ Acceptable ☐ Superior

CRITERION II-B. Sufficient evidence is provided that the applicant is knowledgeable of the "present state of the art" for the intervention proposed.

☐ Unacceptable ☐ Acceptable ☐ Superior

CRITERION II-C. Sufficient evidence is provided that the proposed intervention has educational significance beyond the demonstration site and can be implemented in other locations with reasonable expectations of comparable impact.

☐ Unacceptable ☐ Acceptable ☐ Superior

CATEGORY II SCORE
(maximum = ____ points)

☐

CRITERION CATEGORY III. MEASURABLE OBJECTIVES

CRITERION III-A. The objectives address the stated needs.

☐ Unacceptable ☐ Acceptable ☐ Superior

CRITERION III-B. The objectives are attainable.

☐ Unacceptable ☐ Acceptable ☐ Superior

CRITERION III-C. The objectives are defined in measurable terms.

☐ Unacceptable ☐ Acceptable ☐ Superior

CRITERION III-D. The objectives are arranged in approximate order of importance with primary objectives addressing the expected impact on the population to be served.

☐ Unacceptable ☐ Acceptable ☐ Superior

CATEGORY III SCORE (maximum =____ points)

☐

CRITERION CATEGORY IV. APPROPRIATE ACTIVITIES

CRITERION IV-A. Activities are related to objectives and can be expected to result in attainment of the objectives.

☐ Unacceptable ☐ Acceptable ☐ Superior

CRITERION IV-B. Criteria for selecting participants are clearly described.

☐ Unacceptable ☐ Acceptable ☐ Superior

CRITERION IV-C. Plans are outlined for including potential users in the development of project practices and products.

☐ Unacceptable ☐ Acceptable ☐ Superior

CRITERION IV-D. Procedures are outlined for increasing probability of program longevity or institutionalization.

☐ Unacceptable ☐ Acceptable ☐ Superior

CATEGORY IV SCORE (maximum = ____ points)

☐

CRITERION V. EFFICIENT MANAGEMENT PLAN

CRITERION V-A. The proposal specifies a plan for the management of the project which includes relationships among the involved organizations and individuals, and responsibilities of each.

☐ Unacceptable ☐ Acceptable ☐ Superior

CRITERION V-B. The management plan relates to the project objectives and activities.

☐ Unacceptable ☐ Acceptable ☐ Superior

CRITERION V-C. A realistic time schedule for starting and completing each of the project activities is provided.

☐ Unacceptable ☐ Acceptable ☐ Superior

CRITERION V-D. The project schedule allows sufficient time and effort for planning and start-up.

☐ Unacceptable ☐ Acceptable ☐ Superior

CRITERION V-E. Provisions are made for using formative evaluation as a management tool.

☐ Unacceptable ☐ Acceptable ☐ Superior

CRITERION V-F. An appropriate recordkeeping system for project management is proposed.

☐ Unacceptable ☐ Acceptable ☐ Superior

CRITERION V-G. The managment plan addresses transitional activities required for the survival of the program or use of its products following termination of federal funding.

☐ Unacceptable ☐ Acceptable ☐ Superior

CATEGORY V SCORE (maximum = ___ points)

☐

CRITERION CATEGORY VI. REASONABLE BUDGET

CRITERION VI-A. Total project costs are reasonable in relation to size, scope, duration, and anticipated results of the project.

☐ Unacceptable ☐ Acceptable ☐ Superior

CRITERION VI-B. Budget line items are appropriate for carrying out project activities.

☐ Unacceptable ☐ Acceptable ☐ Superior

CRITERION VI-C. The proposal provides a plan for the documentation of costs to facilitate replication by potential adapters.

☐ Unacceptable ☐ Acceptable ☐ Superior

CATEGORY VI SCORE (maximum =____ points)

☐

CRITERION CATEGORY VII. APPROPRIATE PERSONNEL AND FACILITIES

CRITERION VII-A. Proposed personnel, consultants, subcontractors, and advisory group members have the necessary qualifications for the project.

☐ Unacceptable ☐ Acceptable ☐ Superior

CRITERION VII-B. The project director has management capabilities as well as subject matter expertise.

☐ Unacceptable ☐ Acceptable ☐ Superior

CRITERION VII-C. Amount of time to be committed to the project by each individual is sufficient to carry out the proposed activities.

☐ Unacceptable ☐ Acceptable ☐ Superior

CRITERION VII-D. Provisions are made for adequate support and training of project personnel, teachers, and others, where applicable.

☐ Unacceptable ☐ Acceptable ☐ Superior

CRITERION VII-E. Location(s), facilities, equipment, and materials are appropriate for the project.

☐ Unacceptable ☐ Acceptable ☐ Superior

CATEGORY VII SCORE (maximum = ____ points)

☐

CRITERION CATEGORY VIII. TECHNICALLY SOUND EVALUATION PLAN

CRITERION VIII-A. The proposal includes a plan for the formative evaluation of the project.

☐ Unacceptable ☐ Acceptable ☐ Superior

CRITERION VIII-B. The formative evaluation plan is technically sound so that processes can be reliably related to effects.

☐ Unacceptable ☐ Acceptable ☐ Superior

CRITERION VIII-C. A plan for an appropriate recordkeeping system for the formative evaluation is outlined which documents project processes and effects.

☐ Unacceptable ☐ Acceptable ☐ Superior

CRITERION VIII-D. The proposal provides for an outcome/impact evaluation including appropriate preparations for follow-up.

☐ Unacceptable ☐ Acceptable ☐ Superior

CRITERION VIII-E. The outcome/impact evaluation plan is techically sound so that the observed effects can be attributed to the intervention.

☐ Unacceptable ☐ Acceptable ☐ Superior

CRITERION VIII-F. Standards for judging success are stated in the outcome/impact evaluation plan and are consistent with the project objectives.

☐ Unacceptable ☐ Acceptable ☐ Superior

CRITERION VIII-G. The proposal includes a plan for a recordkeeping system for documentation of results and identification of participants for collection of follow-up data.

☐ Unacceptable ☐ Acceptable ☐ Superior

CATEGORY VIII SCORE (maximum =____ points)

☐

CRITERION CATEGORY IX. COMMITMENT OF APPLICANT ORGANIZATION

CRITERION IX-A. The proposal includes a written statement from the applicant organization and cooperating institutions which specifies the type and amount of support they will provide to the project.

☐ Unacceptable ☐ Acceptable ☐ Superior

CRITERION IX-B. The proposal includes a written statement from the applicant organization which provides evidence of commitment to future funding and/or use of project generated products and practices after termination of federal funding.

☐ Unacceptable ☐ Acceptable ☐ Superior

CATEGORY IX SCORE
(maximum = ____ points)

☐

CRITERION CATEGORY X. EFFECTIVE DISSEMINATION PLAN

CRITERION X-A. Dissemination of information to encourage utilization of the developed practices and products is a project objective.

☐ Unacceptable ☐ Acceptable ☐ Superior

CRITERION X-B. The proposal includes a dissemination plan which identifies procedures, target audiences, and the sources of funding for demonstration and dissemination.

☐ Unacceptable ☐ Acceptable ☐ Superior

CRITERION X-C. The dissemination plan should include an outreach approach and a combination of informative-awareness activities such as newsletters, seminars, conferences, etc., which will be useful to potential adapters in deciding whether or not to replicate the program.

☐ Unacceptable ☐ Acceptable ☐ Superior

CRITERION X-D. The dissemination plan should provide for implementation support to new users.

☐ Unacceptable ☐ Acceptable ☐ Superior

CRITERION X-E. The dissemination plan provides for the demonstration of exemplary features of the program during the last phase of federal support.

☐ Unacceptable ☐ Acceptable ☐ Superior

CATEGORY X SCORE
(maximum = ____ points)

☐

TOTAL POINTS
(maximum = 100 points)

☐

REVIEWER'S COMMENTS AND/OR QUESTIONS:

REVIEWER'S SIGNATURE _____